

Pecos District

Documentation of Land Use Plan Compliance And NEPA Adequacy (DNA) DNA-510-2006-165

Roswell Field Office;

Applicant: Yates Petroleum Corporation

Lease No.: NM-28297

Action Type: APD Resubmittals: Everette "OO" Federal #8 & #11

Location of Proposed Actions: Everette "OO" Federal #8 - Unit Letter J, 1980' FSL & 1980' FEL; Everette "OO" Federal #11- Unit Letter K, 1980' FSL & 1980' FWL, Section 26, T. 5 S., R. 24 E., Chaves County, New Mexico, NMPM.

Description of Proposed Actions: The proposed APDs were previously approved on 8/6/04 and no new changes would occur to the approved plan of development for these wells. An access road and well pad would be constructed for each well and the gas wells would be drilled.

A. Conformance with the Land Use Plan (LUP) and Consistency with Related Subordinate Implementation Plans:

1. Roswell Approved Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision, October 1997.
2. The proposed actions do not conflict with any known State or local planning, ordinance or zoning.

B. Identify the applicable NEPA document(s) and other related documents that cover the proposed actions.

1. RFO EA #: NM-060-04-124
- Date Approved: 8/6/04

C. NEPA Adequacy Criteria:

1. Are the current proposed actions substantially the same action as previously analyzed? Yes.
2. Are the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current proposed actions, given current environmental concerns, interests, resource values and circumstances? Yes.
3. Are the existing analysis adequate and are the conclusions adequate in light of any new information or circumstances? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and all new circumstances are insignificant with regard to analysis on the proposed actions? Yes.
4. Does the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current proposed actions? Yes.
5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed actions substantially unchanged for those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document sufficiently analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed actions? Yes.

6. Can you conclude without additional analysis or information that the cumulative impacts that would result from the implementation of the current proposed actions are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Yes.

7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed actions? Yes.

D. Interdisciplinary Analysis: Identify those team members conducting or participating in the preparation of this worksheet. See attached DNA Checklist.

E. Mitigation Measure:

The provisions for the approval of the DNAs include the Roswell Field Office requirements as defined in the following exhibits for each well; **Exhibit A** - Location Map, **Exhibit B** - Well Drilling Requirements, **Exhibit C** - Conditions of Approval, **Exhibit D** - Permanent Resource Road Requirements, **Exhibit E** - Surface Restoration/Reclamation Requirements, of the approved APD.

Conclusion:

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that the proposals conform to the applicable land use plan and that the existing NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed actions. This constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirement of NEPA.

/s/Larry D. Bray

Larry D. Bray, Assistant Field Manager,
Lands and Minerals

7/31/06

Date